

**REMARKS**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. This response is meant to supplement the response filed July 25, 2005, which was in response to the Office Action dated April 25, 2005. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claim 22 stands allowable. Previously, Claim 23 stands allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 14 was rewritten with the limitations of independent Claim 23 therein. Claim 23 stands canceled. Claim 24 was added. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments above.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Yamamoto* (5,774,819). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites a lateral dynamic sensor, a steering wheel angle sensor, a road wheel steer angle sensor, and a yaw rate sensor. The Applicants direct the Examiner to Fig. 4. As can be seen, the present invention is directed to a feed forward/feedback system, although this is not specifically recited in Claim 1. The invention determines the variable *u* which is the actual commanded steering input. A corrected road wheel steering angle input and modified steering wheel input are used together to form the actual commanded steering input *u*. The determination of the corrected steering wheel input and the modified steering wheel input are different from those set forth in the *Yamamoto* reference. The controller determines a desired yaw rate in response to the steering wheel angle signal as illustrated in block 52. A modified steering wheel input is determined as a function of the desired yaw rate in block 54. The desired yaw rate is also fed forward. Thus, the feedback controller 55 determines the corrected steering wheel input as a function of the desired yaw rate, actual yaw rate, the lateral dynamic condition of the vehicle, and the road wheel angle sensor.

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Yamamoto* reference does not teach a road wheel angle sensor. The Examiner conveniently left off the reference numeral for the road wheel angle sensor which he says is included in the *Yamamoto* reference. The signal from the road wheel angle sensor is used to determine the corrected steering wheel angle input. Because there is no road wheel steering angle sensor, no signal for determining the road wheel steering angle signal is set forth. Therefore, no corrected steering wheel input as a function of the road wheel angle sensor is set forth. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that because each and every element of the claims is not found in the *Yamamoto* reference, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claim 8 has a similar limitation to the steering actuator position from a road wheel position sensor and therefore is believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of Claim 23 which were previously indicated as allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of these claims as well.

Claims 5, 9, 12, 13, and 15-16 are dependent claims which are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

Claims 2-4, 10, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamamoto* in view of *Klosterhaus* (5,002,142). The *Klosterhaus* reference does not teach or suggest determining a steering wheel input as a function of the desired yaw rate, actual yaw rate, and the condition of the road wheel angle signal. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claims 2-4, 10, 18, and 19.

Claims 6, 7, 11, 17, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamamoto* in view of *Serizawa*.

As mentioned above, the *Yamamoto* reference has several deficiencies. The *Serizawa* reference also does not teach or suggest those deficiencies. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claims 6, 7, 11, 17, 20, and 21.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all objections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: 8-16-2005